

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2675
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of parasternal injection of bupivacaine on postopeartive pain for early extubation in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass surgery
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a valuable study on the efficacy of parasternal injection of bupivacaine in reducing postoperative pain and facilitating early extubation in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass surgery. The findings contribute significantly to clinical practices aimed at optimizing pain management and recovery in cardiac surgery patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Efficacy of parasternal injection of bupivacaine on postoperative pain for early extubation in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass surgery," is suitable. However, it could be refined to "Efficacy of Parasternal Bupivacaine Injection for Pain Management and Early Extubation in Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and clearly presents the study objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. No significant additions or deletions are needed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized and appropriate for the content.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is scientifically robust, with a well-defined hypothesis, methodology, and statistical analysis. The randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled design strengthens the validity of the findings, making it technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient and relevant, covering recent and significant studies related to the topic. No additional references are suggested.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical adjustments could further enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prashanth Kumar Patnaik
Department, University & Country	RVM IMS, India